

HANGING IN THE BALANCE.

FATE OF THREE CITY BILLS.

NEW-YORK.

BIPARTISAN LEGISLATION—GREAT POWER PRO-

CONSOLIDATION OF THE CITIES IN
DANGER OF DEFEAT.
FROM THE REGULAR CORRESPONDENT OF THE TRIBUNE.

Albany, May 5.—Three bills relating to New-York City which have not become laws, but which, if they do become laws, will modify its charter in many important respects, are now hanging, as it were, in the air, and the members of the Legislature are beginning to speculate as to their fate. These measures are the Bipartisan Police bill and the Supplemental Police bill, now in Mayor Strong's hands, and the Greater New-York bill, which latter measure has not yet passed the Legislature. And the measure which will have a great influence upon the future development of Greater New-York is in the hands of Mayor Strong and of Mayor Schieren—namely, the East River Bridge bill.

NEW-YORK CITY POLICE LEGISLATION.
Mayor Strong has been urged by the Rev. Dr. Markhurst and others to veto the Bipartisan Police bill, and has been advised by Lieut.-nain-Governor Saxton and the leading Republicans in the Legislature to sign it. Governor Morton, it is understood, also has been advised Mayor Strong to sign the act. Yet if Mayor Strong should veto the measure, it is probable that the Legislature would pass it over his veto, since the Republicans are unanimously in favor of the bipartisan principle. The only branch of the Legislature that it might not pass would be the Senate; but even in that body there is every indication that the measure would once more pass.

People here are curious as to the probable fate of the legislation known as the Supplemental Police Bill. This bill greatly enlarges the powers of Thomas F. Byrne, the Superintendent of Police, making him a larger man, more powerful and more important than the Mayor of the City of New York.

MR. PLATT AND SUPERINTENDENT BYRNE

There has been some suspicion here, whether justified or not, that the late Mayor, William L. Gaynor, and Superintendent Byrne were the originators of this measure, and that its design has been to preserve Mr. Platt's grip upon the Police Department, even though there should be a Board of Police inclined to be independent of him and his counsel. The Board of Police, which was created by Mayor Veit, Avery D. Andrews and Andrew D. Parker, is now composed of Frederick D. Grant, Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., and William L. Gaynor.

The bill also determines whether or not he desires Superintendent Byrnes or any other superintendent to be largely independent of them, and only removable upon charges which may be considered an infraction of discipline or of the laws past, the Board of Police presides at trials of policemen charged with infractions of discipline or accused by citizens of any offence which may be considered an infraction of discipline or of the laws past, to court, whose members are to be appointed by the Superintendent. The proposed law says that charges made or preferred against any member of the force shall be tried by a court of three members. The court shall be tripartite before a court consisting of not less than three nor more than five officers of the force, of the rank

GRANT POWER TO THE SUPERINTENDENT
The large powers given to the Superintendent of Police are also evident in the following extracts from the suggested law now before Mayor Strong:

As many police trial courts may be in session it is necessary to dispose of all charges promptly. Each court shall only hear such charges as are brought before it, and if the court is not in session it convenes it to hear, and after their disposition and determination shall be disbanded. No member of any police trial court shall be removed from office in this chapter, shall be fined, reprimanded, removed, suspended or dismissed from the police force until he or she has been removed from office, fined, reprimanded or dismissed by the police force, or until he or she, or he or them, nor until such charges shall have been examined, heard and investigated before a police trial court.

GREAT POWER TO THE SUPERINTENDENT

Police are also evident in the following extracts from the suggested law now before Mayor Strong:

Each court shall only hear such charges as a Superintendent of Police may refer to it. After the hearing, and after their disposition and determination shall be made, no member of the Police Force shall be fined, reprimanded, removed, suspended or dismissed from the Police Force unless he or she has been first charged with the offence by the Superintendent of Police or him or them, nor until such charges shall have been examined, heard and investigated before a Police Committee or a Sub-Committee of the Police Committee or a Sub-Committee of the Board of Police, upon such reasonable notice as shall be given to the member or members charged, and the decision of the Police Committee or Sub-Committee of the Board of Police may or shall, by rules and regulations, from time to time prescribe, provided, however, that no member of the Police Force shall be fined, suspended or dismissed from the Police Force by resolution of the Board of Police upon the recommendation of the Police Committee or Sub-Committee of the Board of Police.

against the superintendent or Chief of Police shall be heard, investigated and determined by the Board of Police Commissioners. The Board shall have a copy of the rules and regulations, or any or either of them, of the Police Department or Board of Police Commissioners, and shall be advised of any violation certified by the President of the said board and the chief clerk or the first deputy clerk of said Police Department, or by the superintendent or Chief of Police, of any violation, hearing or proceeding in or about before any tribunal, commissioner, or commission, or any other body, with the same force and effect as the original.

When any member of the force shall be convicted of any police law, code, or regulation, or violation of orders, or absence without leave or any conduct injurious to the public peace and welfare of the city, or any other offense, or any other offense, or any other breach of discipline, the court shall have power to punish the offending party by reprimand, suspension without pay during such suspension, or by a recommendation that the offending member be removed from the force, or by a recommendation by the Chief of Police, but no more than thirty days pay or salary shall be forfeited or deducted for any suspension, and no more than thirty days pay or salary without pay pending the hearing, investigation or

without pay pending the hearing, investigation and determination of charges duly made against him pursuant to the provisions of this act, and upon

investigation, hearing and determination of such charges. It is found that such member so charged is innocent of the charges made or preferred against him upon which he has been suspended, and the evidence in his favor is such as to justify the finding of the court that the charges are unfounded, the court shall recommend to the Superintendent or Chief of Police that a member so charged be reinstated in the force. When a police trial court shall recommend to the Superintendent or Chief of Police that a member of the force be dismissed it shall send with its judgment to the Superintendent or Chief of Police the evidence taken by the court in support of its finding of guilty. The Superintendent or Chief of Police may view the whole proceedings, modify the findings of the court by inflicting a lesser or

ment that the one recommended, or ordering, was prior to a new police trial court. The Superintendent shall file his written judgment with the chief clerk of the department, and the offending member shall be suspended from duty until the day after the trial, where the Superintendent or Chief of Police is present at the trial of any member of the force charged with a crime. The Superintendent or Chief of Police shall hear the evidence, and then and there approve or disapprove of the charges, and the Superintendent or Chief of Police shall be considered the final authority in all matters of discipline, and his decision shall be deemed to have taken effect from the date of his decision of the Superintendent or Chief of Police.

ure to gather forces against it. Ordinarily a Senator does not desire the defeat of his own bill, but it

possible that political considerations may have brought Senator Lexow into that state of mind. Jacoby Worth is known to be opposed to the Greater New-York bill, and it is not without political importance as the Platt sub-boss in Brooklyn. It is also known that Worth has acquired a large influence over Mr. Platt, and the latter has always possessed a great influence over Senator Lexow. There is reason, therefore, for the suspicion that Senator Lexow is not sincere in giving the Greater New-York bill a genuine support.

The Senate and the Assembly will vote this week upon the Greater New-York bill, and then the public can determine the sincerity of Senator Lexow.

support of the measure. It simply provides for the commission to draw up a charter for the Greater New York City, and the commission will consist of Aldermen John H. Green, president of the present Greater New York Commission; Mayor Strong, of New York; Mayor Rogers, of Brooklyn; and Mayor McCarty, of the Island City. Engineer Adams, Attorney-General Hancock and nine other persons to be appointed by the Governor, by and with the consent of the Senate.

MAY BE KILLED BY A VETO.

If the Legislature should adjourn this week, it would seem to be impossible to obtain answers to the questions of the Senate, and a veto would be a time for the measure, for the Senate to act upon.

approving of the measure for the Senate to act with the Governor in appointing the nine members of the new Greater New-York Commission. Possibly Lexow, in Mr. Platt's interest, has deferred action upon the bill until late in the season with the design of throwing into Governor Morton's hands the bill, which he will then be able to get passed by a majority of the members of the commission. The policy, however, puts the bill in peril since if it is not passed by any one of the three Mayors concerned, it would fail to become a law, as the Legislature would not be in session, probably, to pass it before the veto.

The opposition to the Greater New-York bill has been so strong that it is probable that the bill is in that it is in danger of defeat. This would postpone for at least a year the adoption of a charter for Greater New-York.